1/25/70

Dear Dick,

I jst got your note of 1/19 with the 399 memo enclosed. On the note, my lips are sealed on this matter.. I've not been in touch with Nichols but I will heed your words and report nothing of this to him. Now I regret that he got in on this whole business for it was I who sent him my Archives letter on the lost fragment.

As for the memo itself--it seems excellent. I haven't getten a chance to read it as good as I want but your points seemX sound. Frazier testified that the jacket was copper alloy but did not specify if the lead was alloy. It is my understanding that all military bullets have this lead alloy core. The only mention of a combination of lead and antimony is by Hoover on the curb mark, never by Frazier. This could well because the head and C fragments were just lead with n o antimony. I'll have to check his words more carefully.

The only thing on that now concerns p. 8. You credit Harold with having turned up the bit about 399 loosing a fragment while being photographed. It's funny; here I am now telling you about credit. Unless you refer to another incident, I believe that this was my doing. Don't be mad for I regard it as a simple error. Likewise, you use my base picture without my permission. It is not that I would deny you it(for right now I wouldn't). These are things which I did and you criticized me for. We are all human.

I'll detail now what I said about Tink's head shot measurements. Harold asked me to and I think you'll be interested.

In the appendix on this in Six Secs, check the table of data. The measurements were made on color blow-ups of the frames(sc he says) and it is important to note that these enlargemtns were apparently on no scale. His reference line AB jumps from 54 to 51 mm. between 311 and 312 and then to 55mm at 313. Be suspicious of this for, whether it be the real case or not, it is the perfect adjustment for the final values he gets which have the head moving forward two inches at 313. Here is the clincher. Look at what he designates as reference points A,B, and C on a sketch of 312(p. 276). If you check the frames, point A does not appear on 302, 303, 314, 315, and it is too drawn out for measurement on 313, 319, 320-322, 324-330. Just by this, you can see that he can get no valid data at the crucial moment, 313 to 315. And he cannot use another frame which shows this point as a reference since his own table shows that it varies in every frames he measured. Point B is a big laugh; it is not fixed, just a product of light highlights. Even so, Mrs. K's arm blocks that out from 301 to 309. At best, the data he presents is approximated. However, that renders it completely invalid for anything. I think it is faked because of the amount of significant figures he presents. The general directions of movement(forward then backwards) still hold based on superimosition. The rest is just nonsense. You just cannot do it--that it, take such measurements from this film.

I must stop now. Good luck.

cc. Weisberg